IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA EASTERN DIVISION

KINERA LOVE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CASE NO.:
v.)	03-06cv1147-MHT-SRW
)	
DOLLAR GENERAL CORPORATION,)	
d/b/a DOLGENCORP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL

The Plaintiff, by and through her attorney of record, respectfully submits this Motion to Compel the Defendant to respond to the Plaintiff's discovery requests. As grounds, the Plaintiff offers the following for the Court's consideration:

- 1. That the Plaintiff propounded her discovery requests upon the Defendant on 14 January 2007, by sending a facsimile of the requests on the said date (see attached Exhibit A transmission verification report and facsimile cover sheet) and by United States regular mail;
- 2. That the counsel for the Parties discussed the discovery responses and the summary judgment response on 15 January 2008, during their face-to-face settlement conference. The defense counsel informed the Plaintiff's counsel that the responses were being sent to her and the Plaintiff's counsel informed him that she would respond to the summary judgment motion but needed time to review discovery responses;
- 3. That on Wednesday, 22 January 2008, the Plaintiff's counsel received an email that shows the defense counsel sent out a facsimile of some responses on 16 January 2008, as well as on Thursday, 23 January 2008, by court filing (Doc. #21 Exhibit 1). Despite the fact that defense counsel stated that he sent

the responses by regular mail, he contradicts his own statement on the facsimile cover sheet by indicating that no original was to follow in mail (see Doc. #21-2, pp. 2 of 31 and 3 of 31). To date, the Plaintiff's counsel has not received any response to the Plaintiff's discovery requests that were allegedly sent by regular mail;

- 4. The Plaintiff's counsel has not received any of the discoverable documents that were requested of the Defendant, nor has she received a verified copy of the response to the interrogatories as required by Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In effect, the Defendant has not responded to the Plaintiff's requests, as the ones the Defendant proposes have been submitted are incomplete, deficient and inadequate. The Plaintiff finds that the Defendant's Opposition to her Motion for Reconsideration is quite strange, especially since defense counsel indicated he would not oppose the request for a reasonable delay to respond to the summary judgment motion, and since the Defendant has not complied fully with the discovery rules;
- 5. The Plaintiff still is in need of the discovery to respond to the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, and avers that with the discovery, she can overcome the said Motion, and believes the Defendant knows this, thus its delay in responding and providing the requested documents. The Plaintiff certainly shows this to be an unforeseen or unavoidable circumstance well beyond her control; and,

2

 $^{^{1}}$ Rule 33 states, in part, ... "(2) The answers are to be signed by the person making them, ...".

#7), set the discovery deadline in this case for 15 February 2008. There is still time for the Defendant to respond to the Plaintiff's request by submitting complete and sufficient discoverable responses.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Plaintiff prays that this Honorable Court will grant her Motion to Compel and require the Defendant to provide complete and sufficient discoverable responses to the Plaintiff's discovery requests so that she may respond to the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Lateefah Muhammad
Lateefah Muhammad (Ala. Code MUH001)
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF
Lateefah Muhammad, Attorney At Law, P.C.
Post Office Box 1096
Tuskegee, Alabama 36087
(334) 727-1997 telephone and facsimile
lateefahmuhammad@aol.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on 23 January 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing Motion to Compel to the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following: Ryan Aday, Esquire, attorney for Defendant.

<u>s/Lateefah Muhammad</u> Lateefah Muhammad

EXHIBIT A

Case 3:06-cv-01147-MHT-SRW Filed 01/23/2008 Page 2 of 3 Document 22-2

TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 12/14/2007 05:35 NAME : ATTY L MUHAMMAD FAX : 3347271997 TEL : 3347271997 SER.# : E6X167300

DATE,TIME FAX NO./NAME DURATION PAGE(S) RESULT MODE

12/14 05:32 12053286000 00:02:40

15 OK STANDARD ECM



A facsimile from

LATEEFAH MUHAMMAD, ATTORNEY AT LAW, P.C. 3805 West MLK Highway Tuskegee, Alabama 36083

334-727-1997 telephone/facsimile

For

To: Ryan M. Aday, Esquire OGLETREE DEAKINS P.C.

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT

Phone number: 205-328-1900 Fax number: 205-328-6000

Date: 12/14/2007

RE: LOVE v. DOLLAR GENERAL STORES, d/b/a DOLGENCORP, *INC.*, 3:06ev1147-MHT-SRW

Comments: Please see attached Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for Production. Feel free to call, if necessary.

OUR CLIENT FILE #05-0154/KINERA LOVE

PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY REQUESTS

This message is intended ONLY for the use of the Addressee and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended Recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, duplication or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by the telephone number above and return this original message to the above address by United States mail. Thank you.